

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner's communication mailed April 15, 2004 has been received and carefully considered. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this paper constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action. Specifically, claim 16 has been canceled and claims 11, 25 and 28 have been amended. In addition, detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented. Reexamination and/or reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 18, 19, 21-24 and 29 were allowed.

Claims 14 and 16 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 11-13 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arakawa (JP 06-190458 A).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakawa in view of Official Notice.

Claims 25-27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirabayashi in view of Arakawa.

### **Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the Reference(s) of Record**

**Claim 11**, as amended, calls for a hemming blade to be forced to pivot from a first position to a second position as the hemming blade engages a sloped surface of an anvil. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references of record, including Arakawa, disclose or fairly suggest a hemming die being forced to pivot from a first position to a second position as the hemming blade engages a sloped surface of an anvil. In Arakawa, the hemming die 24 is pivotally moved between a pre-hem and a regular hem position, but is not pivotally moved as a result of the hemming blade being forced to pivot as it engages a sloped surface of an anvil. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 11 and claims 12-15 and 17 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

**Claim 25**, as amended, calls for an engagement between a hemming tool and a support surface while the hemming tool is moved further in a first direction to move the hemming tool angularly relative to a support surface. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references of record, including Arakawa, disclose an engagement between

a hemming tool and a support surface while the hemming tool is moved further in a first direction to move the hemming tool angularly relative to the support surface. Specifically, in Arakawa, the hemming blade 24 is pivotally moved irrespective of an engagement between the hemming blade 24 and a lower die 14. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 25 and claims 26-27 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

**Claim 28**, as amended, calls for an engagement between a sloped surface of anvil and a hemming die to cause pivotal movement of the hemming die about a single axis fixed on the upper body. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references of record, including Arakawa, disclose or fairly suggest an engagement between a sloped surface of an anvil and a hemming die to cause pivotal movement of the hemming die about a single axis fixed on the upper body. As already discussed, in Arakawa, a hemming die 24 pivotally moves, but is not pivotally moved as a result of an engagement between the hemming blade 24 and a lower die 14. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 28 and dependent claim 29 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably over the references of record.

### **CONCLUSION**

All formal and informal matters having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that the claim changes clearly place the application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, if the Examiner is of the view that the amendments do not place the application in clear condition for allowance, it is requested that he telephone the undersigned for purposes of conducting a telephone interview to resolve any outstanding differences. In any case, an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP



Christopher B. Fagan, Reg. No. 22,987  
Erik J. Overberger, Reg. No. 48,556  
1100 Superior Avenue  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582


October 11, 2004  
Date

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

<b>Express Mail Label No.:</b>
<b>Date</b> October 11, 2004

<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Printed Name</b> Audrey M. Dragon

N:\SFKZ\200002\USVAMD0003271V001.doc